UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,844	02/25/2004	John Douglas Methot	ORACL-01438US1	2952

74739   7590   01/22/2009
Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
Oracle International Corporation
Attn: Patent Docketing 32nd Floor
Post Office Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037

EXAMINER
KEATON, SHERROD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/22/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,9,12,15-18 and 20-36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-36* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the filing on 10-02-08. Claims 2-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19 have been canceled and Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18 and 20-36 are pending and have been considered below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1, 9, 12, 15-18, 21-31 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coulthard et al ("Coulthard" 2004003091 A1) in view of Calahan (7058940 B2), and Cohen (US 7024658 B1).

Claim 1: Coulthard discloses an online help functionality for and IDE and content that is context sensitive help (content specific to the tool) and provides search capabilities that are updated in the integrated development environment (Page 2, Paragraph 8). Coulthard does not explicitly disclose the help display being configured to display content in a web browser. However Cohen discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being configured to display content in a web browser (Column 2, Lines 3-13). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time of the invention to display content in a web browser of the modified Chan as taught by Cohen. One would have been motivated to include the help display content in a web browser in order to allow user access multiple help files through hyperlinked pages.

Coulthard does not explicitly disclose wherein the documentation content for the integrated development environment extension is integrated with the help system during the import of the integrated development environment extension. However Calahan provides functionality for extensions and integration of the extensions (Column 2, Lines 4-7 and 37-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide additional extension functionality in Coulthard as taught by Calahan. One would have been motivated to include this functionality as an improvement of capabilities to the system of Coulthard.

Claim 9: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 1 above and further discloses that the help system can be integrated with an extension installation mechanism (Calahan: Column 2, Lines 37-49).

Claim 12: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose an extension as an IDE extension as in Claim 1 above and <u>Cohen</u> further discloses an extensible help facility for a computer software application and further discloses the help system being externally controllable (Column 3, Lines 5-20).

Claim 15: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a help system including context-sensitive help topics as in Claim 1 above and further disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID (<u>Coulthard:</u> Page 2, Paragraph 8).

Claim 16: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified Java class (<u>Coulthard:</u> Page 1, Paragraph 6; <u>Calahan:</u> Column 4, Lines 28-34). Both systems show the ability to utilize java resources.

Claim 17: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose that help topics are organized by a context ID as in Claim 15 above and further disclose the context ID is a fully qualified name from a non-Java resource (<u>Coulthard:</u> Page 1, Paragraph 6; <u>Calahan</u>: Column 4, Lines 28-34). Both systems show the ability to utilize non-java resources.

Claim 18: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system as in claim 1 above wherein the documentation content is in HTML or XML format (<u>Calahan:</u> Column 4, Lines 7-16).

Claim 21: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system as in Claim 1 above wherein the IDE widgets, controls, and control properties are associated with the documentation topics that can be automatically displayed in the help system when requested by a user performing a context sensitive help gesture (<u>Coulthard:</u> Page 2, Paragraph 8).

Claim 22: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system of claim 1 and further disclose wherein a control is installed, documentation for the control is integrated with the help system during the installation of the control (Cohen: Column 9, Line 60-Column

10, Line 54). Here the system allows for imports and updates without restarting the

application (dynamic) meaning that the data is imported during integration.

Claim 23: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system of claim 1 and further

disclose wherein each control class, method, callback, field and property has a unique

context ID. (Cohen: Column 8, Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that

defines the content, layout etc. therefore the data included in that file will contain unique

context ID for that particular content.

Claim 24: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system of claim 1 and further

disclose wherein the integrated development environment issues a context id to the

help display when a context-sensitive help gesture is performed. (Cohen: Column 8,

Line 53-Column 9, Line 15). Here code is provided that defines the content, layout etc.

therefore the data included in that file will contain unique context ID for that particular

content allowing for context sensitive help.

Claim 25: Is similar in scope to Claim 1 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 26: Is similar in scope to Claim 9 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 27: Is similar in scope to Claim 12 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 28: Is similar in scope to Claim 15 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 29: Is similar in scope to Claim 16 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 30: Is similar in scope to Claim 17 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 31: Is similar in scope to Claim 18 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 33: Is similar in scope to Claim 21 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 34: Is similar in scope to Claim 22 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 35: Is similar in scope to Claim 23 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 36: Is similar in scope to Claim 24 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

3.   Claims 20 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over <u>Coulthard et al ("Coulthard" 2004003091 A1)</u>, <u>Calahan (7058940 B2), and Cohen

(US 7024658 B1)</u> as applied to claim 1 in further view of <u>Chong et al ("Chong" US

20020184610 A1)</u>

Claim 20: <u>Coulthard, Calahan and Cohen</u> disclose a system as in Claim 1 above but do

not explicitly disclose that the documentation content can support delivery of help for a

particular component in a JAR file. However <u>Chong</u> discloses that component can

support a JAR file (Page 30, Paragraph 436). Therefore it would have been obvious to

one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide documentation

of the modified <u>Coulthard</u> to support a JAR file as taught by <u>Chong.</u> One would have

been motivated to provide this support to improve functionality and operability of the

system.

Claim 32: Is similar in scope to Claim 20 and therefore rejected under the same

rationale.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new

ground(s) of rejection.

5.   Applicant's argue that Cohen does not disclose an integrated development

environment. However Cohen has been provided to disclose the help functionality as

claimed by applicants. Additionally Cohen does not explicitly disclose use of an

integrated environment but does disclose customizing help for different environments.

By combination with Coulthard the environment in which the help of Cohen (Column 3,

Lines 55-59) would be customized would be an integrated development environment.

Conclusion

Applicants amendments necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set

forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the

mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of

this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened

statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sherrod Keaton whose telephone number is 571) 270-1697. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. and alternating Fri. off (EST).If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-3800.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SLK
1-15-09

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175